



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/788,636	02/21/2001	Eric Andrew Knopf	ARC920000017US1	8586

26381            7590            12/17/2002  
LACASSE & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
1725 DUKE STREET  
SUITE 650  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER	
LEWIS, DAVID LEE	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2673	

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No. <b>09/788,636</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Knopf</b>
Examiner <b>David L. Lewis</b>	Art Unit <b>2673</b>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 21, 2001
- 2a)  This action is FINAL.      2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- 4)  Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) 43 is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on Jul 25, 2001 is/are a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a)  All b)  Some\* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)      4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)      5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 2      6)  Other:

Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Allowable Subject Matter*

1. **Claim 43 allowed.**

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
3. **Claims 1-7, 11-13, 25-29, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Latocha et al. (5790371).**
4. **As in claim 1, Latocha et al. teaches of a portable computer display device including one or more mating sections for docking with similar portable computer display devices, figure 3a, column 3 lines 23-30, said display device comprising: a computer display with associated supporting cabinet structure, figure 3a, column 1 lines 42-67, column 2 lines 23-30; said associated supporting cabinet structure having one or more exterior sides where one or more corresponding edges of said display**

Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer

are exposed, **figure 3a**; at least one electrical connector disposed within said associated supporting cabinet structure and proximate to said one or more exterior sides, said at least one electrical connector capable of connecting in a mating relationship with a corresponding electrical connector in said similar portable display device wherein said one or more exposed display edges substantially abut a corresponding exposed display edge of said second similar portable device when said electrical connectors are connected, **figure 3a, column 2 lines 1-25, column 4 lines 3-12**. Wherein Latocha et al. teaches of PDA being adapted with a mating male and female plug device on the side of said device, wherein the two PDA devices combine to form a larger working space, made out of the combined displays, wherein the computer software allows the PDA's to share information and drives the displays as one display area, as found in claim 1.

5. **As in claim 25, Latocha et al. teaches of a portable computer display device including one or more mating sections for docking with similar portable computer display devices, said display device comprising:** a computer display with associated supporting cabinet structure having a display surface, **figure 3a**; said associated supporting cabinet structure having an exterior side where a corresponding edge of said display is exposed, **figure 3a**; at least one electrical connector disposed on said housing along said exterior side, **figure 3a**; at least one mating element disposed on said housing along said exterior side, **figure 3a**; wherein said electrical connector and mating element are disposed such that when said device is docked with a second similar portable display device via a mating electrical

**Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer**

connector and a mating element disposed along a side of said second device having a corresponding exposed display edge, said display edges are substantially contiguous and the display surfaces of said devices are substantially coplanar, **figure 3a, column 5 lines 48-67.**

6. **As in claims 2 and 26, Latocha et al. teaches of** wherein said computer display is logically re-mapped when connected to said second similar portable computer display device to be part of a single display comprising the displays of both devices, column 1 lines 60-67, column 3 lines 25-35.  
**As in claims 3 and 27,** Latocha et al. teaches of wherein said portable computer display device shares processing power when connected to said similar portable computer display device, column 3 lines 15-35. **As in claim 4,** Latocha et al. teaches of a wherein said one or more exterior sides comprises two exterior edges, figure 1c, figure 3a. **As in claim 5,** Latocha et al. teaches of a wherein said display is substantially rectangular in shape and a first one of said two exterior sides extends along a length of said display while a second one of said two exterior edges extends along a width of said display, figure 2b. **As in claims 6 and 28,** Latocha et al. teaches of wherein said portable display device is connected to said similar portable display device along said first one of said two exterior sides providing a portrait orientation display, figure 1a-f. **As in claims 7 and 29,** Latocha et al. teaches of wherein said portable display device is connected to said similar portable display device along said second one of said two exterior sides providing a landscape orientation display, figure 1b. **As in claims 11 and 33,** Latocha et al. teaches of wherein data processed by said

**Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer**

connected devices is synchronized prior to disconnection of said devices, column 1 lines 61-67. **As in claim 12**, Latocha et al. teaches of wherein said device further comprises one or more structural connectors for structurally mating said device to said similar device, figure 1c and 3a. **As in claim 13**, Latocha et al. teaches of wherein said device abuts in a substantially coplanar configuration, figure 3a,b.

***Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 8-10, 14-24, 30-32, and 24-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Latocha et al. in view of Ohgami et al. (5574625).**

9. **As in claims 14 and 34, Latocha et al. teaches of a portable computer display device capable of sharing hardware with similar portable computer display devices by docking with said similar devices, said display device comprising: a computer display with associated supporting cabinet structure, figure 3a; electrical and structural connectors disposed on said portable computer display device, and**

**Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer**

and structural connectors and said device is receptive to docking via said electrical and structural connectors to a similarly configured portable computer display device to form a single display, **column 2 lines 1-15, column 3 lines 25-35, column 4 lines 5-15.** However Latocha et al. is silent as to said associated supporting cabinet structure comprising one or more movable sections, said one or more movable sections located on one or more corresponding exterior edges of said associated supporting cabinet structure and located within an area encapsulated by each of said one or more movable sections. Ohgami et al. teaches of a portable information processing apparatus having multiple port covers, **figure 7 item 22.** Latocha teaches modular displays, conventionally of the type suggested by Ohgami, can be adapted for use as a modular display as taught by Latocha. It would have therefore been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to modify the device of Latocha to include a movable port cover as suggested by Ohgami, for purposes of covering the port/plug when not in use, as is commonly known in such portable devices, as found in claim 34.

10. **As in claims 15 and 16,** Latocha et al. teaches of remapping the displays into a single display, column 1 lines 60-67, column 3 lines 25-35. **As in claims 17-20,** Latocha et al. teaches of said mating plug being on a plurality of sides, and therefore it would also be obvious to have movable port covers on a plurality of sides, as suggested by Ohgami et al., making it possible to assume the portrait or landscape orientations. **As in claim 21-23 and 39-41,** Ohgami et al. teaches of said removable, foldable, hinged port cover, figure 2 items 22 and 32, wherein it would have been obvious to allow

**Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer**

access to the ports of Latocha et al., given the well known port cover usage. **As in claims 24 and 42**, Latocha et al. teaches of said device synchronized data by said mated devices prior to disconnection, column 1 lines 60-67, column 2 lines 1-15. **As in claims 8-10 and 30-32**, Latocha in view of Ohgami et al. teaches of said removable, foldible, hinged port cover, figure 2 items 22 and 32, wherein it would have been obvious to allow access to the ports of Latocha et al., given the well known port cover usage. **As in claim 35**, Latocha et al. teaches of wherein said display is logically re-mapped when connected to said similarly configured portable device to provide a single desktop display for said connection, column 1 lines 60-67, column 2 lines 1-15. **As claims 36**, Latocha teaches wherein said device shares processing power when connected, column 2 lines 1-15, column 3 lines 25-35. **As in claims 37 and 38**, Latocha teaches of said portrait and landscape orientations, figures 1a-e, wherein the device may have mating ports on any side to for a portrait or landscape orientation when two or more devices are combined,

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.  
5467102, 6011545, 6476733, 6002581, 6115883, 6115883.

Serial Number: 09/788,636  
Art Unit: 2673  
Applicant: Knopf

Page 8

**Title: Collaborative Tablet Computer**

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **David L. Lewis** whose telephone number is **(703) 306-3026**. The examiner can normally be reached on MT and THF from 8 to 5. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala, can be reached on **(703) 305-4938**. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is **(703) 305-3900**.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is **(703) 306-0377**.

---

BIPIN SHALWALA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600